

Comment on “Four-Point Resistance of Individual Single-Wall Carbon Nanotubes”

In a recent Letter Gao *et al.* [1] have claimed a dramatic experimental result: the four-probe resistance of a single carbon nanotube sample can be significantly negative at low temperature. This appears to suggest that quantum interference effects from the voltage probes play a crucial role in producing this surprising phenomenon. In this comment we point out a set of serious contradictions.

Gao *et al.* have analyzed their results by the multi-terminal theory of Büttiker [2]. We do not comment here on the Landauer-Büttiker method used for a current-driven system with multiple test probes, with an equal multiplicity of individual chemical potentials. The invocation of several distinct chemical potentials, in various parts of the one system, is moot from the statistical mechanics point of view, and is discussed elsewhere in the literature [3,4].

In a four-probe measurement, one attempts to gauge the natural voltage drop between two separated voltage probes (3 and 4 in this case). Such a procedure has to be highly noninvasive [5] if a meaningful, intrinsic sample resistance is to be extracted. “Noninvasivity” means no disruption whatsoever to the current flow inherent in the sample. Therefore, the voltage drop is a true measure of intrinsic resistance.

Gao *et al.* argued that the chemical potentials μ_3 and μ_4 are both bounded by μ_1 above, and μ_2 below; see Figure 1 of Ref. [1]. The ratio of the four-point and two-point resistances is then $R_{4PT}/R_{2PT} = (\mu_3 - \mu_4)/(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$. According to Büttiker’s theory [2], this is equivalent to $R_{4PT}/R_{2PT} = [\mathcal{T}_{31}\mathcal{T}_{42} - \mathcal{T}_{32}\mathcal{T}_{41}]/[(\mathcal{T}_{31} + \mathcal{T}_{32})(\mathcal{T}_{41} + \mathcal{T}_{42})]$ in terms of the transmission probability functions $\mathcal{T}_{ij}$. If $\mu_3 > \mu_4$, then R_{4PT} is positive; but if $\mu_3 < \mu_4$, then R_{4PT} is negative. The transmission functions $\mathcal{T}_{ij}$ alone determine the sign. Gao *et al.* seem to believe that $R_{4PT} < 0$ comes from strong quantum interference effects.

To cause significant interference, the $\mathcal{T}_{ij}$ s must depend sensitively on the different pathways from the different voltage probes. In the samples of Ref. [1] the voltage probes are a series of complex multi-wall nanotube structures. Unlike in the de Picciotto *et al.* experiment [5], here the probes’ noninvasiveness is less transparent in terms of measurability and controllability. Unless the voltage probes are *known* to be noninvasive, the notion of an intrinsic sample resistance has little meaning. In our view the results and interpretation in Ref. [1] contain several major contradictions.

(a) In the analysis of Gao *et al.* a negative R_{4PT} arises

if and only if the numerator is negative in the Büttiker ratio. For that to happen, $\mathcal{T}_{32}\mathcal{T}_{41} > \mathcal{T}_{31}\mathcal{T}_{42}$. A transmission function usually depends on the height and width of its barrier. For the identical and symmetrically placed probes 3 and 4, the distances between 3&2 and 1&4 exceed 3&1 and 4&2. The larger the distance, the smaller the transmission. Hence, elementary geometry makes the above condition unlikely.

(b) Now consider the original Landauer formulas for two-point and four-point resistance [3]. $R_{2PT} = (h/2e^2)/\mathcal{T}$ and $R_{4PT} = (h/2e^2)\mathcal{R}/\mathcal{T}$, where $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ are total transmission and reflection functions respectively. The formula for R_{4PT} can be derived from the Büttiker relation; see Eq. (3.301) of Ferry and Goodnick [6]. The eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are bounded by 0 and 1, and $\mathcal{R} = 1 - \mathcal{T} > 0$ must conserve unitary probability.

Because R_{2PT} is positive, $\mathcal{T}$ is certainly positive. But if R_{4PT} is negative, as in Gao *et al.*, it means that $\mathcal{R} < 0$. Therefore $\mathcal{T} > 1$. How does this conserve probability?

(c) R_{4PT} is the desired sample resistance. It is a linear-response quantity measured at small applied fields. At zero temperature, it is an *inherent* property of the equilibrium ground state for the (presumably thermodynamically stable) device. If a well calibrated noninvasive method were to be used, one would expect R_{4PT} to be zero (ideal metal/ballistic case) [5] or very small, depending on any residual dissipation. The intrinsic resistance of the sample must, at the very least, be nonnegative to respect the Joule heating law $W = IV \geq 0$ and thus to guarantee thermodynamic stability.

We wish to thank Dr Adrian Bachtold for useful correspondence.

- [1] B. Gao *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 196802 (2005).
- [2] M. Büttiker, IBM J. Res. and Dev. **32**, 317 (1988).
- [3] A. Kamenev and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 155304 (2001).
- [4] M. P. Das and F. Green, J. Phys: Condens.Matter **15**, L687 (2003).
- [5] R. de Picciotto *et al.*, Nature (London) **411**, 51 (2001).
- [6] D. K. Ferry and S. M. Goodnick, *Transport in Nanostructures* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997).

M.P. Das¹, F. Green¹, and J. S. Thakur²

¹ Dept. of Theoretical Physics, RSPHysSE, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia.

² Dept. of Electrical and Computer Eng., Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 48202, USA.